

THE BAPTISTS;

WHO ARE THEY, AND WHAT DO THEY BELIEVE?

A LECTURE,

DELIVERED AT SYDNEY, C. B., NOVA SCOTIA, JANUARY 29, 1877,

BY

REV. W. B. BOGGS, A. M.

(PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.)

ST. JOHN, N. B.:

PRINTED BY McKILLOP & JOHNSTON, CANTERBURY STREET.

1878.

A
286
B63

ERRATA.

Page 33.—17th line from bottom—read “A. D. 627” instead of “1627.”

“ “ 4th line from bottom—read “baptisteries” instead of
“ baptisms.”

“ 52.—Bottom line—read “to us as a people.”

THE BAPTISTS;

WHO ARE THEY, AND WHAT DO THEY BELIEVE?

A LECTURE,

DELIVERED AT SYDNEY, C. B., NOVA SCOTIA, JANUARY 29, 1877,

BY

REV. W. B. BOGGS, A. M.

(PUBLISHED BY REQUEST.)

ST. JOHN, N. B.:

PRINTED BY McKILLOP & JOHNSTON, CANTERBURY STREET.

1878.

A
286
B63

P
C
w
g
I
u

tr
a
m
a
a

b
a
v
w
w
ta
s
to
th
th

w
w
le
c

THE BAPTISTS;

WHO ARE THEY, AND WHAT DO THEY BELIEVE?

THE following address has originated in the thought that it is perfectly legitimate and proper for any Church or body of Christians to make a public statement, from time to time, of what they believe. Such a course may be productive of much good, in enabling us better to understand each other's position. It may save us from false and uncharitable views, and from unintentionally misrepresenting one another.

Another reason which has led to the preparation of this lecture is the fact that much ignorance concerning our doctrines and principles is frequently manifested. We are sometimes misrepresented, and doctrines are attributed to us which no true and enlightened Baptist ever held. Although our principles are plain and simple, many do not know what we believe.

The following, then, aims to be a brief and simple statement, by one who became a Baptist from principle, of the doctrines and principles which Baptists hold most sacredly, as the revealed will of God. It is not designedly controversial. Yet it would be impossible to discuss denominational peculiarities without more or less reference to controverted points. It attacks no one, it upbraids no one, it ridicules no one. At the same time, I must claim the privilege of being free and unfettered in discussing principles, and in appealing to history, for *truth* is the object to be gained. "*Prove all things; hold fast that which is good.*"

I address myself especially to thoughtful persons, who are willing to give a fair, unprejudiced hearing, who can give due weight to evidence and see the force of an argument.

It will be observed that I have devoted a large portion of the lecture to quotations from eminent men. I have done this because of its manifest importance. The almost unanimous con-

currence of the ablest Biblical scholars who have ever lived, concerning certain principles, ought certainly to have greater weight than any private opinion or statement. In making such extracts no unfair advantage has been taken of any man's words: *i. e.*, no author has been made to say what he does not say. The plain, deliberate, published statements of men of learning and reputation, are given, without distorting or wresting them.

I am only too well aware of the grave defects which mar the present effort, and can but regret that more time and ability were not mine in attempting to handle such a theme, and that truth, which I believe to be so divine, and hold so dearly, had not in this instance a worthier exponent.

My object then is, as before stated, to set forth as I may be able in the narrow limits of one address, the leading principles of the Baptists, and to see what History has to say in reference to them.

OUR NAME.

The name "Baptists" has been applied to us to distinguish us from others, and it serves as a convenient designation. In former times it was "Anabaptists," meaning *rebaptizers*, because then, as now, all who were received into our churches, on profession of their faith in Christ, were, according to His command, baptized; whether the ceremony of infant sprinkling had been performed on them or not. This term always was, and still is, repudiated by us as unjust; for, according to our views of Divine truth, we contend that it is not a *rebaptism*, such persons never having been truly, that is, scripturally baptized. The term Anabaptists is rarely used now.

The name "Baptists," as used by us, does not imply that we are followers of John the Baptist. It has no direct reference to him or to any human leader. Nor does it mean that we make baptism the central truth in our religious system. How far we are from doing this will be shown presently.

The term is not the most expressive one that could be used to designate us; for, merely to hold the views which we do concerning *baptism*, is but a part of what is implied in being a Baptist. Not every one who believes in *adult immersion* is a real Baptist. There are great underlying principles, touching personal faith in Christ, loyalty to His word, individual responsibility to Him, and the spiritual nature of His Kingdom, which we regard as the weightier matters.

We have no real name but Christians. But since Christendom is divided into different bodies, there *must* be some way of distinguishing them one from another : and as others are designated Independents, Presbyterians, Methodists, etc., and people choose to call us Baptists in order to have some definite distinction, we do not object to it. So much for the name---that is all it is and all it means.

THE INFALLIBLE STANDARD.

The great fundamental principle of the Baptists is this: *that the word of God is the only, all-sufficient, and infallible standard and authority in religious things.* They demand a "thus saith the Lord" for every doctrine, and rule, and practice for which authority is claimed in the churches of Christ. They insist upon unswerving fidelity to the Holy Scriptures, without adding thereto or taking therefrom. "To the law and to the testimony" is their motto. In place of canon-laws and rubrics, and ecclesiastical institutes, and Books of Discipline, and Directories "by authority," they regard the Bible as the only authoritative statute book in the things of religion.

Surely this principle is the only safe one. For, the slightest departure from it, or the adoption of any other, opens the way for the modification of Christ's laws, or even their abolition, and the substitution of human laws, resulting in unlimited changes of faith and practice.

This principle commends itself as one of prime importance, and requiring the strictest adherence. For, if the Bible is not all-sufficient, and additional regulations need to be made, who shall make them? Wise men differ widely. The learned of one age might repudiate the principles adopted by those of a former age. One council might ignore the decrees of another. And thus endless confusion must ensue. Let the dissensions and distractions of Christendom be the forcible, yet sad illustration. Besides all this, God has said, "the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God." The Lord alone is the rightful law-giver of His Church. His people are not at liberty to *make* laws; their duty is simply to execute and obey those *already made* by the great Legislator.

It is thus that Baptists hold the Headship of Christ. They really and practically hold him as the "Head *over all things* to the Church," "that *in all things* He might have the pre-eminence."

They believe that no command of Christ is non-essential. There is much talk about essentials and non-essentials ; but how can any command of the Redeemer and Head of the Church be unimportant? Every word of His is pregnant with meaning, and weighty with authority.

This principle has not always been firmly held. If it had been unswervingly adhered to from the beginning Christianity would doubtless have been saved from corruption and division, and a complete return to it now would tend greatly to the unity of all believers.

CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

In the matter of Church Government, Baptists believe *that each separate and individual Church is independent of the authority of all other churches, persons, and bodies of men, either civil or ecclesiastical*, and that its affairs are to be administered by its own members, under the authority of Christ. This is generally known as the *Congregational* form of Church policy.

The use of the word CHURCH in the New Testament is instructive on this point. We find it frequently used in the plural, the "churches." When it is employed in the singular, it generally refers to a particular company of believers, in a certain place, *e. g.* : "The Church that was at Antioch;" "the Church of Ephesus;" "the Church in Smyrna," etc. In the other cases where it occurs in the singular, it plainly refers to the whole number of Christ's people, considered collectively, but evidently *never* means a large ecclesiastical organization, embracing a number of churches, such as those of a whole country or province. We find no expression in Scripture corresponding to such terms as the "Church of England," or the "Church of Scotland," or "the ——— Church of the United States." We do not here read of the Church of Judea, or the Church of Galatia, or the Church of Macedonia, but the *churches* of Judea, etc. "Then had the *churches* rest throughout all Judæa and Galilee and Samaria, etc. (Acts ix: 31). "And so were the *churches* established in the faith." (Acts xvi: 5.) Paul speaks of "all the *churches* of the Gentiles" (Rom. xvi: 4), and "the Churches of God" (1 Cor. xi: 16). Again he says, "And so ordain I in all the Churches" (1 Cor. vii: 17), not in the whole Church; and "that which cometh upon me daily, the care," not of the whole church, but "of all the churches" (2 Cor. xi: 28).

We find in the New Testament nothing of the nature of ecclesiastical courts, as they are called, exercising jurisdiction and authority over churches. Our Lord Jesus Christ in his directions for the treatment of offences (Matt. xviii.) recognizes the Church (evidently the individual church to which the offender belongs) as *the ultimate tribunal of appeal*, and its action as *final*. He says, when the previous steps have failed, "tell it unto the Church." He makes not the remotest reference to any higher court of appeal, either ecclesiastical or civil.

We find another illustration of this principle in 1 Cor. v : 2, 5, 12, 13. Paul reproves *the church* at Corinth for not dealing promptly with an offender, and calls upon them, *when they are assembled together*, to deliver him to Satan, etc. Again, in referring to this case (2 Cor. ii : 6), he states that the punishment was inflicted by "many," or literally *by the greater number*, which manifestly means the *majority*.

It has been claimed that the fifteenth chapter of the Acts furnishes authority for Church courts. Is this a valid claim? Let us turn to the account of it.

A church sprang up in the Gentile city of Antioch. Certain men from Judea visited them, and taught that they must be circumcised, or they could not be saved. This doctrine was a subversion of the Gospel. After much discussion it was decided to carry the question to Jerusalem, where most of the Apostles were, and where they would be most likely to ascertain the truth in reference to the disputed doctrine. Paul, Barnabas and others were sent as delegates.

When they were come to Jerusalem they were received *by the Church*, and the apostles and elders. Then a meeting was held to consider the matter. At the close of Peter's address, "*all the multitude* kept silence" while they heard what Paul and Barnabas had to say. Then James spoke, and after his address, "it pleased the apostles and elders, *with the whole church*, to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas," to bear their communication; and the document which they prepared commences thus :—"The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting," etc. We are led to the following conclusions :—

1. This was not a *general* council, for only two churches were represented, and, therefore, it bears no resemblance to modern councils.

2. It was unlike any council which can now be convened, for it was presided over by Apostles and inspired men.

3. It furnishes no warrant for authoritative councils, since they cannot now issue inspired decrees.

4. It was in all respects, and in the highest degree exceptional and extraordinary.

The celebrated Archbishop Whately says :—"As for so-called general councils we find not even any mention of them, or allusion to any such expedient. The pretended First Council at Jerusalem does seem to me a most extraordinary chimera, without any warrant whatever from sacred history."—*Kingdom of Christ*, p. 36.

Mosheim, the great Church Historian, says :—"In those primitive times, each Christian Church was composed of the *people*, the *presiding officers*, and the *assistants or deacons*. These *must* be the component parts of every society. The highest authority was in the *people*, or the whole body of Christians; for even the Apostles themselves inculcated by their example that nothing of any moment was to be done or determined on, but with the knowledge and consent of the brotherhood.—Acts i: 15; vi: 3; xv: 4; xxi: 22."—*Eccles. Hist. Vol. I.*, p. 77 (*Murdock's Translation*).

Again, he says,—"All the churches in those primitive times were *independent* bodies, or none of them subject to the jurisdiction of any other. For though the churches which were founded by the Apostles themselves, frequently had the honor shown them to be consulted in difficult cases, yet they had no judicial authority, no control, no power of giving laws. On the contrary, it is as clear as noon-day, that all Christian churches had *equal rights*, and were in all respects on a footing of equality."—*Vol. I.*, p. 83

And again, he says,—"These councils, of which no vestige appears before the middle of this (2nd) century, changed nearly the whole form of the church. For, in the first place, the ancient rights and privileges of the people were, by them, very much abridged; and on the other hand, the influence and authority of the bishops were not a little augmented."—*Vol. I.*, p. 150.

Dean Waddington, speaking of the churches of the first century says ;—"Every church was *essentially independent* of every other. The churches thus constituted and regulated, formed a sort of federative body of independent religious communities, dispersed through the greater part of the Roman Empire, in continual communication, and in constant harmony with each other."—*Eccles. Hist.* p. 43.

All this agrees precisely with the views held by Baptists concerning the churches of Christ and their government.

Baptists hold that, according to the plain teaching of Holy Scriptures, the regularly appointed *offices* in a Christian church are but *two*—that of *bishop* or pastor, and *deacon*; the first, to minister in things spiritual, and the second, in things temporal.

The New Testament Bishop was certainly not a "lord over God's heritage," placed in authority over a number of churches and ministers in a large district, but was simply the pastor, or one of the pastors, of a church. Paul, in writing to the Church at Philippi, addresses "the saints in Christ Jesus, *with the bishops and deacons.*"

The terms "bishop" and "elder" are synonymous. In Paul's address at Miletus, to the *elders* of the Ephesian Church (Acts xx.), he says, "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers" (episcopous). The same word is here used which is elsewhere translated *bishop*. The elders, therefore, were bishops. The same thing is proved conclusively in Titus i: 5—7.

That these two officers, bishop and deacon, were the only ones recognized in the primitive churches seems evident from Paul's directions both to Timothy and Titus. In treating of the qualifications of church officers, he mentions these only. If others had existed he would undoubtedly have referred to them. We find no warrant in the book for the almost endless variety and gradation of clerical orders and distinctions, from pope to parson, from cardinal to curate, which exist at the present day. We must, therefore, conclude that these offices are the inventions of men; and we are of the opinion that the Lord Jesus Christ does not need men to invent anything for Him. "His work is *perfect*."

Baptist Churches are presided over by "bishops," in the New Testament sense—i. e., overseers or pastors—and their temporal affairs are in charge of deacons.

Baptists call councils from time to time, as occasion seems to require, but no authority is claimed for them. They do not issue "decrees," but are only *advisory*. They are not clerical conclaves, but are composed of private brethren as well as ministers. Baptists hold Associations and Conventions, but they are merely meetings for general religious purposes, and have no legislative authority or ruling power whatever.

And yet, there is probably as much *real unity* among Bap-

tist churches, the world over, as among those which are bound together by extensive, complicated, ponderous ecclesiastical systems, of human origin. Baptist churches, though independent of each other, are united by the most powerful of all bonds, even those specified by Paul, when exhorting the Ephesian Christians to maintain unity (Eph. iv : 4—6);—"There is *one body*, and *one spirit*, even as ye are called in *one hope* of your calling, *one Lord*, *one faith*, *one baptism*, *one God and Father of all*, who is above all, and through all, and in you all."

This system of Church Government, framed, we believe, by Divine wisdom, is characterized by *simplicity*, instead of *complexity*; and yet it is comprehensive enough to meet all requirements, and adequate to the successful settlement of all difficulties, when administered in the spirit of christian love.

It is in connection with this principle of the independence of the churches, that Baptists have ever maintained an uncompromising disapproval of the unhallowed union of church and state; it being perfectly clear that thus united, the Church *must* be secularized by the State, as is lamentably apparent in all such establishments.

SOUL LIBERTY.

Another principle for which Baptists have always contended, is *Soul Liberty*, or *perfect freedom of Conscience*.

Most denominations are very ready to advocate this principle *now*, that in the light of the nineteenth century it is seen to be built on the foundation of truth and justice; but trace back its history, and it will be found to be a distinguishing principle of the Baptists. They have ever stood forth as the champions of perfect religious liberty,—holding that no man, or body of men, civil or ecclesiastical, has a right to interfere with the conscience, or to force anyone to believe this or that doctrine, or to worship God according to this or that form.

The celebrated John Locke, in his *Essay on Toleration*, says:—"The Baptists were, from the first, the friends of liberty; just and true liberty; equal and impartial liberty."

Bancroft, the American Historian, says, "Freedom of conscience, unlimited freedom of mind, was, from the first, the trophy of the Baptists."—*Hist. U. S., Vol. II., pp. 66, 67.*

The first modern treatise ever written upon Religious Liberty was by Leonard Busher, a Baptist, in 1614. Its title is "Religious Peace, or a Plea for Liberty of Conscience." It asks full liberty for men to worship God in the manner they believe

to be right. Three years before that the Baptist Confession of Faith, then published, used this language—"We believe that the magistrate is not to meddle with religion, or matters of conscience, nor compel men to this or that form of religion, *because Christ is the King and Lawgiver of the Church and the conscience.*"

The honor of being the first advocate of religious liberty has been claimed for Jeremy Taylor. This claim is not supported; for, in the first place, his plea is only for *toleration* of a few Christian sects, which falls far short of religious *freedom*; and, moreover, his treatise was issued nearly forty years after that of Leonard Busher.

This principle is so manifestly reasonable and right, and in accordance with truth and equity, that it would be superfluous to enter into an argumentative defence of it. How surprising that the opposite principle of intolerance and persecution—a principle so unreasonable, unjust, unscriptural, and thoroughly bad—should have survived so long!

The name of Roger Williams being inseparably connected with the cause of religious liberty, we cannot pass it over in silence. It is a name on which rests imperishable honor. He was the first advocate of soul-liberty in America. For this cause he was banished from the Colony of Massachusetts, in 1635, by the very men who had fled from their own land to find religious freedom. There is no exhibition of moral heroism in the history of this continent grander than that which is presented by Roger Williams going into exile among savage Indians, and enduring all the hardships of banishment in mid-winter, *on account of principle*; and, under such circumstances founding a Commonwealth, the law of which should be perfect toleration—a commonwealth where, in the language of Judge Storey, "we read, for the first time since Christianity ascended the throne of the Cæsars, the declaration 'that conscience should be free, and men should not be punished for worshipping God in the way they were persuaded He required.'"—*Roger Williams and the Baptists, by Dr. Eddy.*

Baptists, though often suffering persecution from both Papists and Protestants, *have never persecuted*; have never exercised intolerance towards others. It has been said that the reason of this is that they never had the power. This assertion is false, as might be shown by several historical references. Take one instance.

The Colony of Rhode Island was founded under Baptist

auspices. Had Williams and his people chosen to establish the Baptist faith as the religion of the land, they might have done so. Had they desired to secure to themselves peculiar religious privileges and monopolies, and to oppress those who dissented from them, they might have done so. On the contrary, *perfect religious freedom for all* was secured by their laws from the first.

But, the *principles* of Baptists render it impossible that they should persecute. Their views of the individuality of religion, and the spirituality of Christ's Kingdom, forbid that they should coerce men in matters of faith. If they did so, they would cease to be Baptists.

PERSONAL FAITH INDISPENSABLE.

Another foundation principle of the Baptists, and one in which they differ from all the leading sects of Christians, is this: *that personal faith in Christ is the great fundamental requirement, and prerequisite to all ordinances.* They hold that none but those who have believed in Jesus to the saving of the soul, are qualified for either of the sacraments of Christ, or for membership in His Church. We are thus led to the conclusion that ordinances are unmeaning and useless forms, without faith in Christ on the part of the candidate himself. Rivers of water cannot wash away his sin; the sacred supper cannot originate the first impulse of spiritual life.

Faith must be placed *at the very threshold* of religion. Previous to repentance and faith, man is an enemy against God. How, then, can the exercises of religion on the part of such an one be acceptable to Him? It is indispensable; nothing can be substituted for it; nothing can be given as an equivalent; its absence must render void all ceremonies. And it must be *personal* faith. Proxy is inadmissible. "Every one of us shall *give account of himself* to God."

From this principle results our positive and oft-repeated denial that we believe Baptism to be a saving ordinance. There are none who are so determinedly opposed to this deadly error as Baptists. And yet there are persons, intelligent and well-informed in other things, who say, either through ignorance or malice, "Oh! the Baptists believe that you cannot be saved unless you are dipped." And this statement sometimes comes from the pulpit. There never was a charge made more utterly and absolutely false. They no more believe that than they believe one cannot be saved without the Lord's Supper.

It is not the Baptists who, when one is taken suddenly ill, hurry away for a minister to come and baptize him. Baptism, with us, is a profession of faith *already possessed*; and we refuse to baptize any but those who declare their faith in Christ, and their belief that they have been born again. We baptize not because it is *saving*, but because it is *commanded*.

Whether others regard it as really a saving ordinance, or as having some mysterious sort of saving influence, or, at least, as being a channel of grace, let their own statements declare.

The late Rev. Henry Melvill, of London, a representative Episcopalian, with the prayer book open in his hand, says:—"We really think that no fair, no straightforward dealing, can get rid of the conclusion that the Church holds what is called Baptismal Regeneration. You may dislike the doctrine,—you may wish to have it expunged from the prayer-book,—but so long as I subscribe to that prayer-book, and so long as I officiate according to the forms of that prayer-book, I do not see how I can be commonly honest, and deny that every baptized person is, *on that account*, regenerate."—*Melvill's Sermons, Vol. II., p. 306.*

The Augsburg Confession of Faith, the Lutheran standard of doctrine, distinctly declares baptism to be necessary to salvation, and that through it infants become children of God (Art. 9).

The Westminster Confession of Faith, declares baptism to be unto the party baptized "a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his *ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins,*" etc. And yet it is applied, by those who hold this creed, to persons who do not, and cannot believe; so that it signifies in such cases, "ingrafting into Christ, regeneration and remission of sins," without personal faith.

Baptists unequivocally deny, both in their declarations of faith and by their practice, that they believe Baptism to be a saving ordinance.

This principle, viz.: the absolute necessity of personal faith before all ordinances and church engagements and relationships, is of the greatest moment, and cannot be insisted on too earnestly. On it the spirituality of the Church, and the welfare of souls, in one sense, depend. That it is, to a lamentable extent, overlooked, or made void, by various bodies of Christians, is only too evident. Some who *profess* to hold it, *practically* ignore it. Wherever infant baptism is practiced, this principle is violated.

A REGENERATED CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP.

Another Baptist principle, closely allied to the preceding one, is as follows:—*A Church of Christ, according to His word, should be composed only of regenerated persons*; not those who are merely moral and respectable; not those who are but seekers after salvation; not those who can repeat certain creeds and catechisms; not regenerated persons and their offspring, but those alone who make a credible profession of conversion.

All the references to Christian Churches throughout the New Testament imply that they were companies of believers, persons who had become "new creatures" in Christ Jesus. The Apostolic Epistles begin with such salutations as these;—"To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints";—"Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints," etc.;—"To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus";—"To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons";—"To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ, which are at Colosse."

Now, when vital union with Christ, and a consequent renewal of heart and life, are not made the prime and indispensable qualifications for membership in a church, the Scriptural standard is lowered, and the principle here laid down is abandoned. This principle is ignored wherever persons are received into church membership because they have arrived at a certain age, or because they have received a certain amount of religious instruction, or because their parents are religious. A scriptural Church, under such conditions, is a dream.

A regenerated church membership and infant baptism are irreconcilable. They are directly opposed to, and subversive of each other. Because, by infant baptism, persons are brought into the Church, unconsciously and involuntarily, who may never be born again. But they are *members of the Church*. This has been maintained over and over again by leading Pedobaptists. Large numbers, therefore, are brought into the Church in this way who may never possess any vital godliness; and whose conversion is rendered less probable by the fact that something was done for them in their infancy, which they are in danger of regarding as in some sense a spiritual benefit, if not an actual substitute for the new birth. In fact, in some denominations they are taught that it is the new birth. Why should one think conversion necessary when he is taught from

his childhood, as the writer was, that in baptism he was made "a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven?" How unmeaning to preach to "a member of Christ" the necessity of being born again! He might well reply, "I am an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven; the Church made me such; go and preach repentance and regeneration to those who need it." How can a regenerated Church membership be even approximately realized under such circumstances?

It is not claimed that the membership of all Baptist churches is pure. They doubtless include some who have never known Christ by faith. But, while this is to be deplored, it cannot be wondered at when we remember that even under the eyes of the Apostles, false professors, such as Simon Magus, crept into the church. But there is a vast difference between unknowingly receiving some who, although solemnly professing faith in Christ and a change of heart are, nevertheless, unrenewed; there is, I say, a great difference between this and knowingly, deliberately, and purposely introducing large numbers in their natural, unrenewed state, into the Church. If unconverted persons come into the fellowship of our churches, it is not the fault of our principles. We receive those only who make, what we believe to be, a sincere and honest profession of saving faith in Jesus Christ.

BAPTISM—THE SUBJECTS.

Baptists hold that *believers only are fit subjects for baptism*. This, they believe, is abundantly proved by the positive precepts of the word of God, and by the principles of Christ's kingdom. Let us look at the teachings of Scripture. There is not a passage in the Bible where we are told that an infant was baptized; there is not a command in the whole book to baptize infants.

Belief is always the expressly enjoined prerequisite. Take the commission, as recorded by Matthew (xxviii: 19, 20), "Go ye, therefore, and teach (*disciple*) all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching* them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Notice here, first, the *order of the words*—1. Disciple; 2. Baptize; 3. Teach. This order must be significant and important. To affirm the contrary is to charge the Saviour with using indefinite and random speech in one of the most notable utterances which ever fell from His lips. We

learn, then, that the *first* thing is to make disciples, *then* to baptize them, *then* to instruct them in the commands of Christ. If it is asked, how are the servants of Christ to make disciples? we answer, by preaching the glad tidings to sinners. Those who truly believe become disciples. Notice, *secondly*, the *tense of the participle*. It is not *baptisantes*, having baptized, but *baptizantes*, baptizing. Note, in the *third* place, the *gender of the pronoun, autous*, which refers directly to disciples (understood) and cannot refer to nations. It was *disciples* they were to baptize.

But it has sometimes been said that the passage means they were to make disciples *by baptizing* them. This interpretation, besides teaching a most unscriptural doctrine, and being utterly unsupported, is forbidden by John iv: 1—where it is said that the Pharisees heard “that Jesus made *and* baptized more disciples than John.” The making of the disciples and the baptizing of them, are here clearly distinguished.

If we turn to the Commission, as recorded by Mark (xvi: 15, 16), the same doctrine of believer's baptism is clearly taught: “Preach the Gospel to every creature; he that *believeth and is baptized* shall be saved.” Here is the same order—1. Belief; 2. Baptism.

“Then they that *gladly received his word* were baptized.”—Acts ii: 41.

“But *when they believed* Philip, preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.”—Acts viii: 12.

“Then answered Peter, can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, *which have received the Holy Ghost* as well as we?”—Acts x: 46, 47.

“And many of the Corinthians hearing, *believed* and were baptized.”—Acts xviii: 8.

The baptism of the *households* of Lydia, and the Philippian jailor, is not at all at variance with the doctrine of believer's baptism. For, in the case of Lydia, we learn that she was “of the city of Thyatira,” in Asia Minor, far distant from Philippi, where she was converted; and that she was “a seller of purple,” probably a travelling merchant. Is it likely that her household included infants?

Says DEWETTE, “there is nothing here which shows that any, except adults, were baptized. MEYER says:—“When Jewish or heathen families became Christians, the children in them could have been baptized, only in cases in which they

were so far developed that they could profess their faith in Christ, and did actually profess it; for this was the universal requisition for the reception of baptism. On the contrary, if the children were still unable to believe, they did not partake of the rite, since they were wanting in what the act presupposed." OLSHAUSEN says:—"Since a confession of faith preceded baptism, it is improbable in the highest degree that, by 'her household,' children of an immature age are to be understood." These three eminent German commentators are Pedobaptists.

In the case of the jailor, we are expressly told that Paul and Silas "spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house;" and afterwards we read that he "rejoiced, believing in God with all his house."

Let us now hear what Ecclesiastical historians, and other eminent Christian scholars have to say on this subject, especially in reference to the practice of the early church. Since none of us knows, from his own personal knowledge, what have been the belief and practice of Christians in former ages, we must appeal to history, and call for the testimony of those who have made these subjects their special study. And that these may be reliable, they must be men whose ability, learning and opportunities for investigation were of the highest order, whose testimony is irrefragable, and whose works have become standard authorities throughout Christendom. In order that our witnesses may be entirely free from suspicion of partiality, we will not summon a single Baptist to the witness stand.

DR. AUGUSTUS NEANDER, one of the most eminent Church historians, a name of world-wide reputation, says:—"Baptism was administered at first only to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from Apostolic institution."—*Eccles. Hist.*, Vol. I., p. 311, Am. Ed.

Again he says:—"As baptism was closely united with a conscious entrance on Christian communion, faith and baptism were always connected with one another; and thus it is in the highest degree probable that baptism was performed only in the instances where both could meet together, and that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at this period."—*Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, pp. 161, 162.

CURCELLÆUS (died 1659), an eminently learned man, published a critical edition of the Greek Testament. "The baptism of infants in the first two centuries after Christ, was alto-

gether unknown, but, in the *third* century, was allowed by some few. In the *fifth* and following ages it was generally received. The custom of baptizing infants did not begin before the third age, after Christ was born."—*Inst. Rel. Ch., l. I, c. xii.*

PROF. JACOBI, University of Berlin :—"Infant baptism was established neither by Christ nor the Apostles. In all places where we find the necessity of baptism notified, either in a dogmatic or historical point of view, it is evident that it was only meant for those who were capable of comprehending the word preached, and of being converted to Christ by an act of their own will."—*Kütto's Cyclopaedia of Bib. Lit., Vol. I., p. 287.*

BARON BUNSEN, Prussian Ambassador at the British Court for many years, a deeply learned man and voluminous writer on Ecclesiastical subjects :—"Pedobaptism, in the modern sense, meaning thereby the baptism of new-born infants, with the vicarious promises of parents and sponsors, was utterly unknown to the early church, not only down to the end of the second but, indeed, to the middle of the third century."—*Hippolytus, Vol. III., p. 180.*

PROF. MOSES STUART, D. D., Andover Theological Seminary :—"Commands, or plain and certain examples in the New Testament relative to it (infant baptism) I do not find."—*Bib. Rep. for 1833, p. 365.*

THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, a publication of the highest standing. The article from which we quote is attributed to Dr. Hanna, of Edinburgh :—"Scripture knows nothing of infant baptism. There is absolutely not a single trace of it to be found in the New Testament. There are passages which may be reconciled with it, if the practice can only be proved to have existed, but there is not one word which asserts its existence."—*July, 1852, pp. 209-212.*

This testimony might be extended almost indefinitely, plain statements to precisely the same effect having been made by *very many* of the highest authorities in church history and Scripture interpretation, among whom may be specified Luther, Erasmus, Limborch, Schliermacher, Gieseler, Lange, Hagenbach, D'Aubigne, Hodge, Stewart and Woods. This evidence is furnished by men whose denominational position and sentiments would naturally prejudice them against such views, and prevent their making such concessions, unless truth absolutely required it. To suppose that their statements are unreliable is to turn all history into fiction. If, then, this evidence so clear,

so concurrent, so abundant, is true, and infant baptism was not instituted by Christ or the Apostles, the question naturally arises whence, and under what circumstances, did it come?

Its origin is plain. Error in *doctrine* preceded, and gave birth to it. No one who carefully reads the Apostolic Epistles can fail to notice, by the statements made and the warnings given, that error in doctrine and practice were even then beginning to creep into the churches: and the Apostles expressly declared that this should be the case more fully afterwards. Now, if we turn to the writings of the "Fathers," as they are called,—that is, those who lived during the first few centuries after Christ,—we find that one of the earliest and most pernicious errors which developed itself was the doctrine that *baptism saves the soul*, and that salvation is impossible without it. All the evidence needed on this point is a reference to the writings of some of the "fathers." Cyprian, Ambrose, Chrysostom and others speak in the most extravagant terms of the benefits and miraculous effects of baptism. They taught that all who died unbaptized must inevitably be lost. It is easy to see what such a doctrine would lead to. How could parents endure the thought of their dying children sinking to perdition when it was in their power to save them, by having them baptized? CLAUDIUS SALMASIUS, who filled a professorship at the University of Leyden, in 1632, says:—"An opinion prevailed that no one could be saved without being baptized; and for that reason the custom arose of baptizing infants." First, the *design* of the ordinance was corrupted, and that led to unscriptural *practice*. Many authorities might be cited to show that this was the true historic origin of infant baptism. Baptismal regeneration and infant baptism were closely connected *then*; have they *ever* been clearly separated, or can they be?

Another clew to the practice of primitive times is found in the adult baptism of several of the distinguished theologians and preachers of those days,—*although their parents were Christians* of unquestioned intelligence and piety.

Gregory Nazianzen, Archbishop of Constantinople, who died A. D. 389, and whose father was bishop of Nazianzen, was not baptized till he was nearly thirty years old. *Ullman's Gregory of Nazianzen*.

Ephrem, of Edessa, a learned writer (died A. D. 378), was born of parents who "where enobled by the blood of martyrs in their family, and had themselves both confessed Christ before

the persecutors, under Diocletian or his successors. They consecrated Ephrem to God from his cradle, like another Samuel, but he was eighteen years old when he was baptized."—*Alban Butler's Lives of the Saints*.

We learn from ecclesiastical history that Basil of Caesarea, (A. D. 350) though he could boast of christian ancestry for several generations, was not baptized till he was 'twenty-seven years old. Chrysostom (died A. D. 407), the golden-mouthed preacher, Archbishop of Constantinople, and born of Christian parents, received baptism at the age of twenty-eight. Ambrosius, bishop of Milan, was a citizen of Rome, but born in France, A. D. 340. He received a religious education, and was reared in the habits of virtuous conduct; but he was not baptized till he had reached the age of thirty-four. Augustine was not baptized until he was nearly twenty-five years of age, though his mother, Monica, was a woman of great piety, and instructed him carefully in the principles of the Christian religion. Jerome was baptized at the age of thirty-one. The Emperor Theodosius was baptized in the thirty-fourth or thirty-fifth year of his age, though he had been trained up from his childhood in the Christian faith. How strange that these persons were not baptized in their infancy! Evidently the erroneous practice had not yet become very general.

It is not to be wondered at that Baptists cannot find authority in the word of God for infant baptism, when its advocates are so divided in opinion in reference to it. Some of its ablest defenders point to the Abrahamic Covenant, as containing the main strength of the scriptural argument in its favor. Other equally high authorities declare that the Abrahamic covenant furnishes no ground for infant baptism. Some denominations baptize infants *in order to bring them into the Church*; others baptize them *because they are already in*. There is a perfect chaos of opinion in regard to it. The reasons alleged for its observance are wondrously diverse. What we ask is a "thus saith the Lord." Its advocates admit that Christian baptism is a New Testament ordinance. We ask, therefore, New Testament authority for its application to infants; but instead of that, we generally have a long, labored, involved and inconclusive argument from the old Testament.

We are told that baptism came in place of circumcision, and therefore ought to be administered to infants, as that Jewish rite was. We reply: if that is the case, is it not most unaccountably strange that "the Apostles, and elders, and brethren"

They con-
 Samuel,
 "—*Alban*

Casarea,
 cestry for
 enty-seven
 mouthed
 Christian
 Ambro-
 in France,
 as reared
 baptized
 stine was
 s of age,
 iety, and
 istic re-
 ne. The
 or thirty-
 f m his
 hese per-
 ne erron-

authority
 eates are
 its ablest
 ining the
 e. Other
 covenant
 minations
 e; others
 a perfect
 d for its
 a "thus
 baptism
 w. testa-
 instead of
 unconclu-

sion, and
 t Jewish
 st unac-
 brethren"

at Jerusalem did not say so, when this very question of circum-
 cision came before them? The converts at Antioch had been
 taught by some that circumcision was still binding, and that it
 was necessary for them to observe it. How easy, then, for the
 Council at Jerusalem to have settled the whole difficulty by
 simply saying that baptism had taken the place of circumcision,
 and that, therefore, it was unnecessary longer to observe the old
 ordinance. But do we find the remotest shadow of a hint of
 any such doctrine in the utterances of that body? Certainly
 not. This silence is inexplicable if the above view were then
 held.

If baptism came in place of circumcision, then, to carry out
 the analogy, it ought to be administered *only to males* (Gen.
 xvii: 10); and a man's *slaves or servants* ought to be included
 as well as his offspring (Gen. xvii: 23, 27); and, moreover,
 those who are baptized ought to be admitted to the Lord's Sup-
 per as the circumcised were to the passover (Exod. xii: 4).

BAPTISM—THE MODE.

Baptists hold that *Scriptural Christian Baptism is the im-
 mersion of a believer, in water, in the name of the Father,
 Son, and Holy Spirit.* This, they believe, the Word of God
 plainly teaches.

"Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the
 region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him *in Jordan*,
 confessing their sins."—Matt. iii: 5, 6.

"And were all baptized of him *in the river of Jordan*," etc.
 —Mark i: 5.

"And Jesus, when he was baptized, *went up straightway out
 of the water.*"—Matt. iii: 16.

"And it came to pass in those days that Jesus came from
 Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John *in Jordan*.
 And straightway *coming up out of the water*," etc.—Mark i:
 9, 10.

"And John also was baptizing in Ænon, near to Salim,
because there was much water there."—John iii: 23.

"And they *went down both into the water*, both Philip and
 the Eunuch, *and he baptized him.* And when they were *come
 up out of the water*," etc.—Acts viii: 38, 39.

"Therefore we are *buried with him* by baptism into death;
 that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of
 the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."—
 Romans vi: 4.

"Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."—Col. ii: 12.

It is clear that they went down into the water, and came up out of the water; but what was the act performed while they were there? This is the point at issue. The act is always expressed by a certain word, in one or other of its forms.

The unvarying use of this word is very significant. If *mode* is a matter of indifference, why is *one, distinct, definite term* always employed? If a *variety of modes* was intended, why do we not find a *variety of terms* used? There was no poverty of words or forms of expression, for the Greek was a remarkably rich and copious language. There were *rantizo* to sprinkle, *keo* to pour, *louo* to wash, and other words to express the various ways in which water could be applied to the person, or the person to water. How strange that *some* of these were not *occasionally* used by *some* of the writers in the New Testament! But it is always *baptizo*. Evidently *one definite act* was intended. Let us then call for evidence concerning the meaning of this word; for if we can ascertain that, we shall know what Christ and his Apostles practiced and commanded. We turn first to—

LEXICONS OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

GROVES—To dip, immerse, immerge, plunge.

SCHREVELIUS—Mergo, lavo.

GREENFIELD—To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT—To dip repeatedly; of ships, to sink them; *Baptisis*, a dipping; *Baptisma*, that which is dipped; *Baptistes*, one that dips.

DAWSON (enlarged and revised by Taylor)—To dip, or immerse in water.

DONNEGAN—To immerse repeatedly into a liquid, to submerge.

BASS—To dip, immerse or plunge in water.

ROBINSON—To dip in, to sink, to immerse; a frequentative in form, but apparently not in signification.

PICKERING—To dip, immerse, submerge, plunge.

DUNBAR—To dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink.

SCAPULA—To dip or immerse; also to dye, as we immerse things for the purpose of coloring or washing them.

BAGSTER—To dip, immerse, to cleanse or purify by washing.

JONES—To plunge, to plunge in water, dip, baptize, bury overwhelm.

It is needless to extend this list. The *same meanings* are given by Alstedius, Bailey, Schoettgenius, Parkhurst, Pasor, Hedericus, Young, Robertson, Stokius, Stephanus, Suidas, Schleusner, Bretschneider, Suicerus, Richardson, and others. *All* agree in giving dip, or immerse, as the ordinary meaning of the word. If the Greek Lexicon has ever yet been published which gives *sprinkle* as the meaning of *baptizo*, it has been most carefully concealed, and kept out of reach of those who have investigated this question. Writers on the subject have sometimes made the *assertion* that such Lexicons exist; but this assertion requires to be substantiated, for grave doubts rest upon the truth of it. But the important fact is that *all Lexicographers of any note* are unanimous in their definition of the ordinary meaning of the word.

Now let us turn to the

STANDARD ENCYCLOPEDIAS.

ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA.—“Baptism is derived from the Greek *baptizo*, to dip or wash. The usual mode of performing the ceremony was by immersion, but the practice of baptism by sprinkling gradually came in, in spite of the opposition of Councils and hostile decrees. The Council of Ravenna, A. D. 1311, was the first Council of the Church which legalized baptism by sprinkling, by leaving it to the choice of the officiating minister.”

EDINBURGH ENCYCLOPEDIA.—“The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner:—Pope Stephen II. being driven from Rome by Astolphus, King of the Lombards, A. D. 753, fled to Pepin, who, a short time before, had usurped the throne of France. While he remained there, the monks of Cressy, in Brittany, consulted him whether, in case of *necessity*, baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant would be lawful, and Stephen replied that it would. But though the truth of this fact be allowed—which some Catholics deny—yet pouring and sprinkling were only admitted in cases of necessity. It was not till 1311 that the Legislature, in a Council held at Ravenna, declared immersion to be indifferent. In this country (Scotland), however, sprinkling was never practised in ordinary cases until after the Reformation. And in England, even in the reign of Edward VI., immersion was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there gradually imbibed the opinions of that

Church. In 1556, a book was published at that place containing the forms of prayers and ministrations of sacraments approved by that famous, and godly, and learned man, John Calvin, in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin, and returning to their own country in 1559, with John Knox at their head, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland this practice made its way into England, in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the Established Church."

CHAMBERS' CYCLOPEDIA.—"It is, however, indisputable that in the primitive church the ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion, in order to which baptisteries began to be erected in the third, perhaps in the second century." Again—"It was the ordinary practice in England, before the Reformation, to immerse infants, and the fonts in the churches were made large enough for this purpose."

ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA.—"Baptism, that is, dipping, immersing, from the Greek word *Baptizo*. In the time of the Apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered. The immersion of the whole body was omitted only in the case of the sick, who could not leave their beds."

KITTO'S CYCLOPEDIA OF BIB. LIT.—"The whole body was immersed in water."

NATIONAL CYCLOPEDIA.—"The manner in which the rite of baptism was performed appears to have been at first by complete immersion. It was the practice of the English, from the beginning, to immerse the whole body."

CHURCH HISTORIANS.

MOSHEIM, Chancellor of the University of Gottingen in 1755. "In this (1st) century baptism was administered in convenient places without the public assemblies, and by immersing the candidates wholly in water."—*Eccles. Hist.*, Vol. I., p. 104.

Again he says (2nd century)—"The candidates for it (baptism) were immersed wholly in water, with invocation of the sacred Trinity, according to the Saviour's precept."—Vol. I., p. 179.

NEANDER, already quoted on another subject—"The usual form of submersion at baptism, practiced by the Jews, was

passed over to the Gentile Christians. Indeed, this form was the most suitable to signify that which Christ intended to render an object of contemplation by such a symbol; the immersion of the whole man in the spirit of a new life."—*Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, p. 161.

GUERICKE, Henry E. F., Doctor and Professor of Theology of Halle—"Baptism was originally performed by immersion in the name of the Trinity."—*Ancient Church History*, p. 141.

VENEMA (17th century)—"It is without controversy that baptism in the *primitive* church was administered by immersion into water, and not by sprinkling. The essential act of baptizing in the *second* century consisted not in sprinkling, but in immersion into water, in the name of each person of the Trinity. To the essential rite of baptism in the *third* century pertained immersion and not aspersion, except in cases of necessity; and it was accounted a *half perfect* baptism. Immersion, in the *fourth* century, was one of those acts that were considered as essential to Baptism."—*Eccles. Hist.*, *Cent. I.*, par. 138; *Cent. II.*, par. 100; *Cent. III.*, par. 51; *Cent. IV.*, par. 100.

KURTZ, Professor of Eccles. Hist. at Dorpat—"Baptism was administered by a complete immersion in the name of Christ, or the Triune God."—*Eccles. Hist.*, *Vol. I.*, p. 70.

SCHAEFF, DR. PHILIP, of New York—"Finally, by the general usage of ecclesiastical antiquity, which was *always immersion*, as to this day in the Oriental, and also the Greco-Roman Churches." *Church History*, p. 568.

COMMENTATORS, ETC.

1—Reformers.

MARTIN LUTHER—On the Sacrament of Baptism (*at the beginning*)—"First, the name Baptism is Greek; in Latin it can be rendered immersion, when we immerse anything into water, that it may be all covered with water. And although that custom has now grown out of use with most persons, (nor do they wholly submerge children, but only pour on a little water) yet they ought to be entirely immersed, and immediately drawn out. For this the etymology of the name seems to demand."—*Op. Lutheri*, 1564, *Vol. I.*, fol. 319.

JOHN CALVIN—"The word baptize itself signifies *immerse*, and it is certain that the right of immersing was observed by the ancient church."—*Institution of the Christian Religion*, *Book IV.*, chap. 15.

ZWINGLI—"Into his death ; when ye were immersed into the water of baptism ye were ingrafted into the death of Christ ; that is, the immersion of your body into water was a sign that ye ought to be ingrafted into Christ and his death."—*Annotations on Romans vi : 3 ; Works, vol. iv., p. 420.*

WILLIAM TYNDALE—"The plunging into the water signifieth that we die, and are buried with Christ, as concerning the old life of sin, which is Adam. And the pulling out again signifieth that we rise again with Christ in a new life, full of the Holy Ghost, which shall teach us, and guide us, and work the will of God in us, as thou seest Romans vi."—*Obedience of a Christian Man, edition of 1571, p. 143.*

2—Roman Catholic.

EST, Chancellor of the University of Douay—"For immersion represents to us Christ's burial, and so also his death. For the tomb is a symbol of death, since none but the dead are buried. Moreover, the emersion, which follows the immersion, has a resemblance to a resurrection. We are, therefore, in baptism conformed not only to the death of Christ, as he has just said, but also to his burial and resurrection."—*Comment. on the Epistles ; Rom. vi : 3.*

BRENNER—"Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and regularly an immersion of the person under the water, and only in extraordinary cases, a sprinkling or pouring with water ; the latter was, moreover, disputed as a mode of baptism, nay, even forbidden."—*Historical Exhibition of the Administration of Baptism from Christ to our own times, p. 306.*

BISHOP BOSSUET, of Meaux, France, (died 1704)—"We are able to make it appear, by the acts of Councils and by ancient rituals, that for thirteen hundred years baptism was administered by immersion throughout the whole Church, as far as possible."

3.—Episcopalian.

ARCHBISHOP TILLOTSON—"Anciently, those who were baptized were immersed, and *buried* in the water, to represent their death to sin, and then did rise up out of the water, to signify their entrance upon a new life, and to those the Apostle alludes—Rom. vi : 4-6."—*Sermons vii., p. 179.*

BISHOP TAYLOR—"And the ancient churches did not, in their baptism, sprinkle water with their hands, but immersed the catechumen or the infant." After some references in proof of this assertion, he adds:—"All which are a perfect convic-

tion, that the custom of the ancient churches was not sprinkling, but immersion, in pursuance to the sense of the word in the commandment, and the example of our blessed Saviour."—*Rule of Conscience, Book iii., chap. iv., Rule xv.*

DR. WHITBY—"It being so expressly declared here (Rom. vi: and Col. ii: 12) that we are 'buried with Christ in baptism,' by being buried under water, and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death by dying to sin, being taken hence; and this immersion being religiously observed by all christians for thirteen centuries, and approved by our Church; and the change of it into sprinkling, without either any allowance from the author of this institution, or any license from any Council of the Church, it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use."—*Commentary on the New Testament—Rom. vi: 4.*

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON.—"It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water, to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from his momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our Northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of Scripture."—*Life and Epistles of St Paul, Vol. I., p. 439.*

Again they say, in a note on the passage "Buried with him by baptism"—"This passage cannot be understood, unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."—*Vol. II., p. 169.*

4—Presbyterian.

WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES.—"In this phrase the Apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient manner of baptism, which was to dip the persons baptized, and, as it were, bury them under the water for a while. and then to draw them out of it and lift them up, to represent the burial of our old man and our resurrection to newness of life."—*Annotations, published in folio, under the auspices of the Assembly—Annot. on Rom. vi: 3, 4.*

DR. CHALMERS—"We doubt not that the prevalent style of administration in the Apostles' days was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water. We advert to this for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in

these verses. Jesus Christ, by death, underwent this sort of baptism by an immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection. We, by being baptized into his death, are conceived to have made a similar translation, in the act of descending under the water of baptism, to have resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending to emerge into a second or a new life."—*Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, on Chap. vi. : 3, 4.*

DR. GEORGE CAMPBELL, President of Marischal College, Aberdeen—"The word *Baptizein*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies 'to dip,' 'to plunge,' 'to immerse,' and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin fathers, 'tingere,' the term used for dyeing cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning."—*Translation of the Gospels; note on Matt. iii: 11.*

This same writer says, "I have heard a disputant, in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered in the New Testament, baptize, means more properly to sprinkle than to plunge, and in defiance of all antiquity, that the former method was the earliest, and for many centuries, the most general practice of baptizing. One who argues in this manner never fails, with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause he would defend; and though with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as arguments, sometimes better; yet a candid mind will disdain to take help of a falsehood, even in support of the truth."—*Lectures on Systematic Theology, p. 480.*

5—Wesleyan.

JOHN WESLEY—"Buried with him by baptism,"—alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."—*Comment on Rom. vi: 4.**

DR. ADAM CLARKE—"We are buried with him by baptism into death." It is probable that the Apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water, which seemed to say, the man is drowned; is dead; and when he came up out of the water, he seemed to have a resurrection to life; the man is risen again; he is alive!"—*Comment on Rom. vi: 4.*

* When this lecture was delivered it contained another quotation from Mr. Wesley; but I have since been assured by an esteemed Wesleyan minister, that it was written before Mr. Wesley's conversion, or before he became the founder of Methodism; and therefore, in fairness, it is omitted.

Again, on the passage "*baptize for the dead*," he says, "But as they receive baptism as an emblem of *death*, in voluntarily going under the water, so they receive it as an emblem of the *resurrection* : unto eternal life, in coming up out of the water ; thus they are *baptized for the dead* in perfect faith of the resurrection."—*Comment on I. Cor. xv : 29.*

The above are *but a few* of the extracts of similar import, which might be given. All the great German commentators and critics, such as Tholuck, Meyer, Gesenius, DeWette, Bretschneider, Fritzsche, Winer, Rheinwald, Halm, etc., *have said the same thing* ; as also Bloomfield, Doddridge, Lightfoot, Moses Stuart, Wall, Baxter, Whitefield, Towerson, and *many* more. Volumes might be filled with such quotations stating, not in ambiguous or equivocal language, but in the *plainest, most unqualified terms*, that baptism, as instituted and practiced by Christ and the Apostles, and continued for centuries, was immersion, and that only. The man who stands up in these days to defend sprinkling, or pouring, as the *primitive mode of baptism*, has all the *learned* Christian world against him.

It is sometimes said, when we cite the published utterances of eminent biblical scholars of different denominations in support of our views, that we build our faith and practice more on the words of men than on the word of God. This is false. We build our faith and practice on *nothing but the word of God*. And we make such quotations only to show that the highest authorities in Ecclesiastical History and Scripture Interpretation, in all communions, have really taken the same *views* of God's Word, which we do, whatever their *practice* may have been. Thus, the doctrines which we hold, *because we believe them to be God's truth*, are supported by the ancient history and the scholarship of Christendom.

But it is said, "Why quote such utterances, when it is well known that many of the men who made them held, at the same time, the faith and practice of the denominations to which they belonged?" We reply that, with that we have nothing to do. To their own Master they stand or fall. Whether they taught and practiced contrary to their convictions of truth, it is not for us to inquire. The fact remains that they unanimously admit the truth, and scripturalness, and antiquity of those very doctrines and practices which, we believe, the Divine oracles plainly teach. But why did they make such admissions?

Genuine scholarship and a fearless honesty required it. And their statements are published, and, therefore, given to the world.

THE PRACTICE OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

The practice of the Greek Church is worthy of notice. The New Testament was written in Greek. What can be fairer than to submit the question to the Greeks themselves? If it had been originally written in the Welsh or Gaelic language, certainly it would be important to ascertain what the original and unvarying understanding of its terms had been by the Welsh or Gaelic people.

The Greek, or Eastern Church, so called, in distinction from the Roman, Latin, or Western Church, extends over Greece and all through Russia, from the Black Sea to Siberia, and has branches scattered through Egypt, Abyssinia, Arabia, Palestine, and other African and Asiatic countries. Now, it is well known that the Greek Church has *always* practised, and still invariably practices, immersion in baptism, even in the severe climate of Northern Russia.

Dr. Wall, an Episcopalian, Vicar of Shoreham, England, declares, "The Greek Church, in all its branches, does still use *immersion*, and so do all other Christians in the world except the Latins. All those nations of Christians that do now, or formerly did, submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by *pouring* or *sprinkling*; but all other Christians in the world, who never owned the Pope's usurped power, *do*, and *ever did*, dip their infants in the ordinary use. All the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one-third part of Europe, are of the last sort."—*History of Infant Baptism, Part II., chap. 9.*

The celebrated Dean Stanley says:—"There can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that, for at least four centuries, any other form was either unknown, or regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, as an exceptional, almost a monstrous case. To this form the Eastern Church *still rigidly adheres*; and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid. The Latin Church has wholly altered the mode, and, with the two exceptions of the Cathedral of Milan, and the sect of the Baptists, a few drops of

water are now the western substitute for the three-fold plunge into the rushing rivers, or the wide baptisteries of the East."—*Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*, p. 29.

Alexander de Stourdza (of the Greek Church), Russian State Councillor, says:—"The distinctive characteristic of the institution of baptism is *immersion*, *baptisma*, which cannot be omitted without destroying the mysterious sense of the sacrament, and contradicting at the same time the etymological signification of the word, which serves to designate it. The Church of the West has, then, departed from the example of Jesus Christ; she has obliterated the whole sublimity of the exterior sign; in short, she commits an abuse of words, and of ideas, in practising *baptism* by *aspersion*, this very term being in itself a derisive contradiction. The verb *baptizo*, *immergo*, has, in fact, but one sole acceptation. It signifies literally, and always, to *plunge*. Baptism and immersion are, therefore, identical, and to say *baptism* by *aspersion*, is as if one should say *immersion* by *aspersion*, or any other absurdity of the same nature."—*Considerations on the Doctrine and Spirit of the Orthodox Church*. Stuttg. 1816, p. 87.

The Greek Church, then, numbering about 97,473,000, and the Nestorians, Maronites, Copts, Armenians, Jacobite Syrians, Abyssinians, and other Oriental Christian sects to the number of about nine or ten millions more,—making, together, over one hundred millions,—have from the first, and still do practice, immersion in baptism. That is, according to Dr. Wall, Dean Stanley, and others, all Christians in the world, except the Church of Rome, and those who came out from her at the Reformation, retain the original mode of baptism.

BAPTISTERIES.

We will now turn to another class of witnesses, by no means the least interesting and satisfactory. Their testimony is a silent one, but most convincing. I refer to the *ancient baptisteries*.

The most ancient one is found in the Catacomb of San Ponziano at Rome. It was in these subterranean passages and chambers that the early Christians of that city sought refuge during the dark days of Pagan persecution. Here they lived and worshipped and were buried. And here they constructed baptisteries for the administration of the sacred rite. Through the Catacomb of San Ponziano a stream of water runs, the channel of which is diverted into a reservoir, which was used

for administering baptism by immersion from the first to the fourth century. The dimensions of the reservoir, which is still full of water, are four and a half feet in length, three and a half in width, and three and a half in depth. See Northcote's *Roman Catacombs*, and *Archæology of Baptism*, by Dr. Cote, of Rome.

On the wall immediately above this font is a fresco painting, representing the baptism of our Saviour. The following explanation of the painting is from Bottari's *Roma Sotterranea*, t. I., p. 194 :—" Upon the wall, over the arch, the Redeemer is represented up to his waist in the waters of the River Jordan, and upon his head rests the right hand of John the Baptist, standing on the shore. It is by mistake that modern artists represent Christ in the Jordan up to his knees only, and John pouring water upon His head. And although on the portico of the Church of San Lorenzo, outside of the wall of Rome, that saint is seen in a painting pouring water upon the head of San Romano, this was certainly not the case, as that picture is far more modern (12th cent.) than those of the first centuries, and the artist was evidently ignorant or wrongly informed concerning the acts of San Lorenzo. It is not improbable, however, that subsequently it became customary to pour water upon the head of the catechumen after he had been immersed. On the other shore an angel is seen upon a cloud, holding the Saviour's robe; the Holy Ghost descends like a dove and alights upon the Redeemer. John places his hand upon the head of Christ to immerse him."

A relic of this kind is of special importance from the fact that the Christians who worshipped in the Catacombs were, in primitive simplicity, in purity of doctrine and practice, nearest to the churches of the Apostolic age. This baptistery and painting in the Catacomb of San Ponziano carry us back almost to the time of the Apostles.

There are at this day at least *sixty-three* ancient baptisteries existing in different parts of Italy, which many travellers have examined and described.

One of the most notable is the *Baptistery of Constantine*, at Rome. It is in connection with the famous Church of St. John of Lateran, the oldest, and in some respects, the most sacred of all the churches of Rome; the "*omnium urbis et orbis ecclesiarum mater et caput*." This baptistery I myself saw and examined in the month of February, 1876. It belongs to the fourth century. The building stands at a little distance

from the Church, is octagonal in form, and very highly embellished. In the centre is a circular basin, twenty-five feet in diameter and three feet deep, lined and paved with marble. A descent of three steps leads to the bottom of the basin, which is provided with a small outlet for the purpose of emptying it after the ceremony had been performed. The water was conducted to the basin from the adjoining Claudian aqueduct, the remains of which are still standing. On the architrave, supported by the columns of porphyry which surround the basin, is a long Latin inscription, which clearly shows what its use was in former ages. References to this interesting relic of antiquity, and to its use for immersion, are found in the works of ancient Italian authors.

We might go on for hours describing the baptisteries of Rome, Naples, Milan, Florence, Pisa, Ravenna, etc. Such structures are to be found in all the principal cities of Italy. But the description given above will suffice to give a general idea of all. One main feature exists in them all, viz.: the large basin, three or four feet deep, with steps descending into it. There they stand as they have stood for many centuries, silent, yet unanswerable witnesses to the practice of Christians in the early ages.

Remains of the same kind are found in France, Belgium, Germany, and other parts of Europe.

The venerable Bede, the Ecclesiastical Historian of Great Britain, says that Paulinus, the Apostle of the North of England, who baptized King Edwin at York, A. D. 627, baptized also great numbers of people in the rivers Glen and Swale.—*Eccles. Hist., Lib. II., cap. xiv.*

The following description of one of the natural baptisteries used by Paulinus is given by a writer in an English paper:—“About eleven miles from the Cheviot Hills, separating England and Scotland, and about the same distance from Alnwick Castle, the celebrated seat of the Dukes of Northumberland, and near the village of Harbottle, there is a remarkable fountain. It rises on the top of a slight elevation, and just now it is thirty-four feet long, twenty feet in breadth, and two feet in depth; but it is capable of being made deeper by placing a board over an opening at one side. The traditions of Northumberland point out this fountain as one of the baptisms of Paulinus, the Apostle of the North of England, where he immersed three thousand during the Easter of A. D. 627. The “History of Northumberland” contains and confirms the testimony of tra-

dition. An ancient statute, as large as life, which formerly lay prostrate in the spring, now stands against a tree on its margin. The drapery of "the bishop," as the statute is called, shows that it was set up at a very remote period, probably only two or three centuries after Paulinus, whom it was doubtless intended to represent. A large crucifix now stands in the centre of the fountain, which bears the following inscription:—"In this fountain, called the 'Lady's Well,' on the introduction of Christianity in the Saxon reign of Edwin, and early in the seventh century, Paulinus, an English bishop, baptized about three thousand people. The 'Lady's Well' is some thirty or forty miles from Newcastle, and is full of interest to the antiquary."—*Rev. W. Cathcart, D. D., in Religious Herald.*

It may, perhaps, be thought by some that I have dwelt at unnecessary length on the proofs of that which is freely admitted by so many. I reply that while it is true that the greatest Christian scholars acknowledge the truth and scripturalness of our views of baptism, both as regards the subjects and the mode, yet there are many persons who, never having looked fully into these questions, consider us in error; and it is against our baptismal views particularly that the strongest opposition, and most bitter prejudice of our Pedobaptist friends, is manifested. Many who speak against our doctrine and practice of baptism evidently do not know the testimony of history with regard to it, nor what so many truly learned and candid Pedobaptists have written. These facts, then, must be my justification, if, indeed, any is required, for devoting so much time to this part of the subject.

CLOSE COMMUNION.

We now come to that much misunderstood and misrepresented subject, that terrible bugbear—*close communion*. What strange misapprehensions exist in regard to it, and what groundless objections are urged against it! Surely no subject has ever been more unfairly treated. What pointless discussions and illogical reasonings have been expended upon it! And what an amount of undeserved opprobrium has been heaped upon its advocates! Let us look at it fairly, and we will find that all the prejudice against it is utterly without foundation.

In the first place, Baptists believe on this subject just what all other evangelical denominations of Christians believe, viz.:—*that Baptism should precede the Lord's Supper*. They believe that the whole tenor of Scripture teaching on the subject, as

well as the nature and mutual relation of the two ordinances, establishes a fixed order between them, and that to place the Lord's Supper *before* baptism is to reverse this order. The highest authorities might be cited to show that this is the almost universal belief of Christendom. Roman Catholics, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Congregationalists, etc., hold that none ought to partake of the *second* ordinance who have not observed the *first*. None of these admit the unbaptized to the Lord's table. Now this is close communion. The only *really open* communionists are those (if any such exist) who hold that *no conditions or qualifications are necessary* to a right approach to the Lord's Supper, and who admit all who choose to come, baptized or unbaptized, converted or unconverted. As soon as any qualification whatever is required the communion ceases to be open. All denominations require certain qualifications; therefore, all are close communionists. And all make *baptism an indispensable qualification*: therefore, all are close communionists on the very ground which is so much complained of in Baptists. Strictly speaking, then Baptists are no more chargeable with close communion than others. So that all the unkind feelings and hard words with which they are so often assailed on the communion question, are unreasonable, and betray either a state of ignorance that is pitiable, or an ungenerous disposition that is certainly very unlike the spirit of Christ. Thus far, then, Baptists and all others are agreed, *viz*: that *baptism should precede the Lord's Supper*.

Secondly. It has been already shown what we believe to be scriptural baptism; that ground need not, therefore, be gone over again at any length. In brief, we believe that the infallible standard—the Word of God—plainly teaches, and ecclesiastical history, and the highest Christian scholarship fully confirm the doctrine, that Christian baptism is the *immersion* of a *believer* in water, in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; and that nothing else answers the requirements of God's Word.

Now put these two things together, and what is the result? We are led immediately, inevitably and logically to the Baptist position on the communion question. While we hold that baptism is *prerequisite* to the Lord's Supper, and that nothing but the immersion of a believer, in water, in the name of the Trinity, is scriptural baptism, we *cannot* occupy any other ground than that of restricted communion. Any other course

would be a most dishonest compromise of principle. Any one with the slightest perception or reasoning power must at once see this.

Our friends who object to our views and practice in this matter must first show us that one or the other of the two positions defined above is unscriptural and erroneous. They could hardly ask us to stultify our reason, and be dishonest to our convictions by practicing free communion while holding the views which we do. In order to make way for a change of practice one of our positions must first be abandoned. Which shall it be? Shall it be the *first*, viz: that baptism must precede the Lord's Supper? That could hardly be expected when we believe so firmly that it is scriptural; and other denominations could scarcely ask this of us, when they hold it just as firmly as we do. Shall it be the *second*? But how can we do that, when, to our minds, nothing is more plainly taught in God's Book than that *believers* only are the proper *subjects*, and *immersion* only the proper *mode* of baptism; and, when, in addition, we have the universal testimony of history, and the admissions of the best and most learned in all branches of Christ's Church to show that our understanding of Scripture on these points is correct? As well might we be asked to adopt the consecrated wafer, instead of bread and wine, at the Lord's table, as to adopt infant sprinkling instead of Scriptural baptism. It is plain then, that we cannot be loyal to God's word, as we understand it, and abandon either of the above mentioned positions. And while we hold them, it is equally plain that we *cannot* be open-communionists. To do that we would have to trample on the teachings of the New Testament, stifle our convictions of truth, and bear about with us continually the consciousness of being inconsistent, illogical and dishonest. The only logical way for a Baptist to become an advocate of free communion is to deny that the Scriptures require baptism before the Lord's Supper. If he can firmly believe that, then the path is open. This is the ground taken by most of those Baptists who hold open-communion views. But how can we accept that doctrine when the Word teaches us that the breaking of bread was observed *by the churches*, and that the churches were composed of those who, having believed on Jesus, were baptized? Let it be shown where the Lord's Supper was observed by any others than companies of Christian disciples; and then let it be shown where there were companies of Christian disciples who were unbaptized. Till this is done we must believe that the blessed commem-

orative ordinance was designed for baptized believers in Christ.

Clearly, then, the difference on this subject between Baptists and other denominations is not in reference to *communion*, but in reference to *baptism*; therefore, let us be charged with *close baptism*, but not with *close communion*. There is no controversy between us and other Christian bodies concerning the necessity of baptism preceding communion; that tenet is common to all. The real point at issue is baptism, the subjects and mode. Therefore, let ours be called close baptism, or let others be called close communionists, in common with ourselves; either will be fair, and will satisfy us.

The following extracts will show that our position is regarded as perfectly logical and consistent by thinking men of other denominations.

The distinguished Dr. Griffin, President of Williams College, says:—"I agree with the advocates of close-communion in two points:—1. That baptism is the initiating ordinance which introduces us into the visible church; of course, where there is no baptism there are no visible churches. 2. That we ought not to commune with those who are not baptized, and, of course, are not church members, even if we regard them as Christians. Should a pious Quaker so far depart from his principles as to wish to commune with me at the Lord's table, while yet he refused to be baptized, I could not receive him; because there is such a relationship established between the two ordinances that I have no right to separate them."

Rev. Dr. Hibbard, a very able writer among the Methodists of the United States, says:—"The charge of close communion is no more applicable to the Baptists than to us, inasmuch as the question of Church fellowship with them is determined by as liberal principles as it is with any other Protestant churches, so far, I mean, as the present subject is concerned, *i. e.*, it is determined by valid baptism."

"To the question, whom shall we admit to the Lord's table? the close-communion Baptist gives precisely the same answer with the great body of those Congregationalists and Presbyterians who are so prone to reproach them with their close communion."—*New York Independent*.

It is worthy of remark "that in one direction, Pedobaptists carry their practice of close communion much farther than the Baptists do; inasmuch as they exclude from the Lord's table a large class of their own members, *viz.*: *baptized children*, not allowing them communion, though they be members. If child-

ren are suitable subjects for baptism, it seems most unreasonable to exclude them from the communion." There can be no doubt that they were admitted to it when infant baptism began to be practiced. It was clearly seen that if they were fit for one ordinance, they were fit for the other also.

When it cannot be denied that our position on the communion question is scriptural and logical, then objection is made to us, usually in one of the following forms ;—

We are told that in inviting to the Lord's Supper none but those who have been baptized, we make too much of baptism ; that we make it a saving ordinance. To this our only and oft-repeated reply is—"We *do not* make it a saving ordinance, nor do we attach any more importance to it than is given to it by the Holy Scriptures. If the divine word makes it binding upon every disciple, as his first duty after believing in Christ, then we must do the same. We dare not change the Master's commands."

It is sometimes said, "Your refusal to invite Pedobaptists to commune with you implies that you do not regard them as Christians." Not at all. We have no such thoughts in reference to them. But we ask, would Pedobaptist churches invite to their communion those whom they regarded as unbaptized, even though they believed them to be converted persons ?

The objection may take this form :—"It is the Lord's table ; why, therefore, do you not invite all who profess to be the Lord's people ?" We reply—it *is* the Lord's table, therefore we are not at liberty to invite any but those who, according to His word, are qualified. If it were *our* table, we might invite whom we pleased, and modify the qualifications as we saw fit, or do away with them altogether ; but we are not at liberty to change the institutions of our Heavenly King.

Again it is said, "We hope to commune together in heaven, why not then on earth ?" One can hardly suppose that such a question as this is asked seriously ; for how can a supposition as to what we *may* do in heaven regulate our conduct on earth when we have the precept and example of Christ and His Apostles to regulate it ?

It is sometimes sentimentally said, in favor of open communion, "How approvingly the angels would look down on such scenes !" To this we reply, one word from the Bible is worth a thousand guesses as to what the angels would approve or disapprove. We suspect, however, that the angels look most approvingly upon such as faithfully keep Christ's ordinances as

they are delivered to them in His holy word, neither adding thereto or taking therefrom anything to suit our fancies or feelings.

Surely it should be the aim of all Christians to reproduce in this age, as nearly as possible, primitive Christianity; and certainly the surest way to do this is to adhere firmly to the teachings of Christ and His Apostles, and to copy closely the New Testament model.

ANTIQUITY OF BAPTIST PRINCIPLES.

If these principles are scriptural, then they are as old as Christianity. And it is because we believe them to be the principles committed by Christ and His Apostles to the primitive churches that we hold them. But let us see what traces of them we can discover during the intervening ages.

We hold that the true succession is succession of doctrines and principles, of faith and works; that the genuine representatives of the primitive Christians, the true successors of the Apostles, are those who hold their doctrines, and follow their examples, as they followed Christ.

The Baptist claim to continuity from primitive times is nothing more nor less than this: that during all the intervening ages there have been persons, at times numerous and prominent, at other times, scattered by persecution and hidden, persons holding *substantially* the same distinctive principles which we hold to-day. But their history is to be "traced by their sufferings for the truth, by the stains of their martyrs' blood, by the light of their martyrs' fires."

President Edwards, speaking of the long, dreary, interval between the rise of Antichrist and the Reformation, says:—"In every age of this dark time there appeared particular persons, in all parts of Christendom, who bore a testimony against the corruptions and tyranny of the Church of Rome. There is no one age of Antichrist—even in the darkest times of all—but ecclesiastical historians mention a great many by name who pleaded for the ancient purity of doctrine and worship. God was pleased to maintain an uninterrupted succession of witnesses through the whole time, in Germany, France, Britain, and other countries. And there were numbers in every age who were persecuted and put to death for this testimony."—*Works, Vol. I., p. 460.*

Those who during this long period stood out boldly against the increasing corruptions of Christianity, the usurped power of

the clergy, and the union of Church and State, and who plead earnestly for liberty of conscience, the sole authority of God's word, and the purity of the Church, were known by different names in different ages and countries; but their leading principles were substantially the same. In the earlier ages there were the Novatians, Donatists, Paulicians and others, and in later times, the Waldenses, Albigenses, or Vaudois.

It is not pretended that all these were Baptists in all respects, and we by no means endorse *all* the sentiments held by the different bodies. It is only claimed that the distinguishing principles of the Baptists have had advocates in every age, and that, too, among those who are universally regarded as the preservers of primitive Christianity during the dark ages.

In the *third* century were the *Novatians*. It was in Rome that their principles began to be declared. The leading principle which distinguished them, and for which they earnestly contended, was *the purity of the Church*. In fact, it was on account of their adherence to this principle that their dissent and separate organization took place. The dominant church had become very lax in discipline, and looked leniently upon gross offences in its members. The Novatians maintained that the *Church should be holy*. They were called *Cathari*, or Puritans; and they rebaptized those who came over to them from the Catholics. See *Mosheim, Cent. III., Part II., ch. v.*

In the *fourth* century the *Donatists* seceded from the rapidly-degenerating church. It was in Northern Africa that this took place. Concerning their principles, Rev. D. C. Eddy, D. D., says:—"A French historian (Crispin) gives the creed of the Donatists, when he charges them with holding the following things:—"First, for purity of Church members, by asserting that none ought to be admitted into the Church but such as are visibly true believers and real saints: secondly, for purity of church discipline; thirdly, for the independence of each church; and, fourthly, they baptized again those whose first baptism they had reason to doubt."—*Roger Williams and the Baptists*, p. 56.

Rev. T. G. Jones, D. D., makes the following quotations—Twisck, Chron. book vi., p. 201, says:—"The followers of Donatus were all one with the Anabaptists, denying baptism to children, admitting believers only thereto who desired the same, and maintaining that none ought to be forced to any belief." D'Anvers, in his Treatise on Baptism, says, "Austin's third and fourth books against the Donatists demonstrate that they de-

nied infant baptism. And, therefore Osiander, in his *Epit. Cent.* 16, p. 175, saith that our modern Anabaptists were the same with the Donatists of old."—*The Baptists*, p. 70.

Rev. Thomas Long, Prebendary of Exeter, published a "History of the Donatists in 1677, in which he says (page 103), that "they did not only rebaptize the adults that came over to them, but refused to baptize children, contrary to the practice of the Church, as appears by several discourses of St. Augustine."

According to Dr. Eddy, "Neander asserts that with the Donatists is to be found the true historical origin of the Waldenses."

In the *seventh* century, and onward for several hundred years, the most prominent witnesses for the truth, and opposers of the wide-spread corruption and ritualism of the dominant church, were the *Paulicians*. Armenia was the principle scene of their earnest protests and terrible persecutions. They became exceedingly numerous, as may be judged from the statement of Mosheim, that, under the Empress Theodora, between A. D. 841 and A. D. 855, about *one hundred thousand* of them were put to death. We are entirely dependent on the writings of their bitter enemies for a knowledge of their doctrines; so that they are probably much misrepresented. This we learn, however, that they protested earnestly against the many errors, both in doctrine and practice, which had grown up in the Catholic Church, and condemned the multiplied forms and ceremonies, the ritualism of that age, such as the worship of the Virgin Mary and the saints, the adoration of the cross and of images, etc. They advocated *great simplicity of worship*. Their opposition to the superstitious and idolatrous worship which then prevailed doubtless led some of them to an extreme position on the opposite side, and disposed them to do away with external forms. Mosheim says, "They rejected baptism as a rite of no use as regards salvation; and *especially the baptism of infants*."—*Cent. XI., Part II., ch. v.* Large numbers of them afterwards removed to the provinces of Bulgaria and Thrace, whence they spread into Italy, so that in the early part of the eleventh century they were very numerous in Lombardy, and Insubria, and especially in Milan. In Italy they were called *Paterini*, and *Cathari*. They afterwards appeared in different countries of Europe. In France they were known as *Albigenses* and *Boni Homines* (good men).

It seems evident that all these different bodies of dissenters, who, during the course of many centuries, in different parts of the

world, and in the face of the fiercest persecutions, maintained their advocacy of primitive Christianity, were *substantially one and the same people*. Holding a common faith, the various branches readily merged into one another. So that the different names used by historians are not generally the names of distinct sects, but different appellations, given in different ages and countries to people, holding *substantially the same principles*.

We now come to the *Waldenses*, who, as a continuation, or blending of the above-mentioned bodies, occupied a very prominent position from the *eleventh* century onwards for many ages, as the principal advocates of "the faith once delivered to the saints," and the firm protestors against the apostacy and corruptions of the Romish Church.

Their principal dwelling places were in the secluded valleys of the Cottian Alps, in Piedmont, on the Italian side, and the Province of Dauphine on the French side. These, I say, were their *principal* retreats; but there were Waldenses, Albigenses, or Vaudois, living in many parts of Europe.

President Edwards, speaking of their Alpine retreat, says:—"It is supposed they first betook themselves to this desert, secret place among the mountains, to hide themselves from the severity of the heathen persecutors which were before Constantine the Great. And there their posterity continued from age to age afterwards. And being, as it were, by natural walls, as well as by God's grace, separated from the rest of the world, never partook of the overflowing corruption."—*Works*, Vol. I., *Hist. Red.* p. 460.

But what were the religious principles of the Waldenses? It is quite a common thing for different bodies of Christians at the present day to claim direct relationship to these ancient witnesses for the truth. And no wonder there is a desire to trace such a connection, for they were the faithful and heroic preservers of gospel truth and simplicity through those long dark ages when the dominant church had gone so far astray.

It is true that since the Reformation the modern Waldenses have yielded some points in their ancient faith, and have generally become Pedobaptists; but it is concerning the *ancient* Waldenses that our present inquiry is made,—those who were God's faithful witnesses during the middle ages.

In seeking to ascertain their principles, it is important to know what was believed and preached by the eminent men who, in different places were identified with them. Peter de Bruys

was one of the most illustrious of the leaders. After twenty years of most successful labor in the South of France, in winning souls to Christ and turning multitudes from the corrupted Christianity of those days, he was burnt at the stake A. D. 1124 or 1130. One of his principles is thus given by Mosheim—"That persons ought not be baptized until they come to the use of reason." *Cent. XII., Part. II., ch. v.* Neander says "that he was an opponent of infant baptism, since he regarded personal faith as a necessary condition for true baptism, and denied the benefit in the case of another's faith.—*Hist. Ch. Rel. and Church Vol. IV. p. 595.*

He was followed by Henry of Lausanne, who preached the gospel boldly, and with great results. The truth as proclaimed by him was accepted by multitudes. He was at last apprehended and committed to prison in A. D. 1148, where he soon after died. Neander says that "he attacked various customs which could not be directly proved from the sacred scriptures, as corruptions of primitive Christianity; such for example, as the worship of saints and infant baptism."—*Hist. Ch. Rel. and Church, Vol. IV. p. 601.* Mosheim says:—"An accurate account of the doctrines of this man, also, has not come down to us. We only know that he, too, disapproved of infant baptism, inveighed severely against the corrupt morals of the clergy, despised the festal days and the religious ceremonies, and held clandestine assemblies."—*Cent. XII. Part II. ch. v.*

In a Waldensian Treatise on Antichrist, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, and the Sacraments, supposed to have been written about the year 1120, it is said of Antichrist that "*He teaches to baptize children* into the faith, and attributes to this the work of regeneration, thus confounding the work of the Holy Spirit in regeneration with the external rite of baptism, and on this foundation bestows orders, and, indeed grounds all his Christianity." M. de Potter, in his account of the Waldenses, says:—"They had a care that it (baptism) should never be conferred on children of a tender age;" and again, "laying stress on the truth that in infancy there can be no actual conversion to the christian faith, they therefore, baptized anew all those who left the Romish Church, wishing to embrace their doctrine." In the public declaration of their faith to the French King, A. D. 1521, according to Montanus, they "assert in the strongest terms the baptizing of believers, and deny that of infants." One of their ancient Confessions of Faith, declares, "We consider the sacraments as signs of holy things, or as the visible

emblems of invisible blessings. We regard it as proper and even necessary that *believers* use these symbols, or visible forms, when it can be done. Notwithstanding, we maintain that believers may be saved without these signs when they have neither place nor opportunity of observing them." Starck, Court Preacher of Darmstadt, in his History of Baptism, says of the Waldenses, "they not only *rejected infant baptism*, but rebaptized those who passed from the Catholic Church to them." Drs. Ypeij and Dermont, in their History of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, say, "It is certain that the Netherlands' Waldenses *always rejected infant baptism*, and administered the ordinances only to adults. We may find this positively asserted by Hieronymus Verdussen, by the Abbot of Clugny, and other Romish writers." The extracts in the foregoing paragraph I have taken from *Roger Williams and the Baptists*, by D. C. Eddy, D. D.; and *The Baptists*, by T. G. Jones, D. D. They are contained also in many other works.

Mosheim says, "I believe the *Mennonites* (Dutch Baptists) are not altogether in the wrong, when they boast of a descent from those Waldensians, Petrobrusians, and others, who are usually styled *the Witnesses for the truth*, before Luther. Prior to the age of Luther there lay concealed, in almost every country of Europe, but especially in Bohemia, Moravia, Switzerland and Germany, very many persons, in whose minds was deeply rooted that principle, which the Waldensians, the Wickliffites, and the Hussites maintained, some more covertly, and others more openly, namely, that the Kingdom which Christ set up on the earth, or the visible church, is an assembly of *holy* persons; and ought, therefore, to be entirely free, not only from ungodly persons and sinners, but from all institutions of human device against ungodliness. This principle lay at the foundation, and was the source of all that was new and singular in the religion of the *Mennonites*; and the greatest part of their singular opinions, as is well attested, were approved some centuries before Luther's time, by those who had such views of the nature of the Church of Christ."—*Cent. XVI.; Sect. III., Part II., ch. vi.*

In the early part of the present century, the King of the Netherlands appointed his chaplain, Rev. J. J. Dermont, and Dr. Ypeij Professor of Theology in the University of Groningen, to prepare a history of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands. The result of their investigations was given to the world, in their work published at Breda in 1819. They were Pedobap-

tists, and, of course, had no inclination to favor the Baptists any farther than truth required. They say, "We have now seen that the Baptists, who were formerly called Anabaptists, and in later times Mennonites, *were the original Waldenses*, and who, long in the history of the church, received the honor of that origin. On this account *the Baptists may be considered as the only Christian community which has stood since the days of the Apostles*, and as a Christian Society which has preserved pure the doctrines of the gospel through all ages."

In exact agreement with this is the statement of that illustrious Christian philosopher, Sir Isaac Newton, whose ecclesiastical investigations were only less extensive and profound than his philosophical. He is said to have frequently expressed the opinion that "the Baptists were the only Christians who had never symbolized with the Church of Rome."—See *Appleton's American Cyclopedia*.

BAPTIST MARTYROLOGY.

The Martyrology of the Baptists would form an almost endless record of persecution and suffering. Age after age they were oppressed in the most relentless manner. Of them it might truly be said, "they had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment; they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheepskins and goatskins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented, (of whom the world was not worthy); they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth."—*Heb. xi: 36-38*.

According to Mosheim, "Vast numbers of these people (Baptists) in nearly all the countries of Europe would rather perish miserably by drowning, hanging, burning, or decapitation, than renounce the opinions they had embraced."—*Cent. XVI., Sect. III., Part II., ch. vi.* Cardinal Hosius, who presided at the Council of Trent, says of the Baptists:—"There have been none for these twelve hundred years past, that have been more grievously punished."

Time would fail to enumerate even a small proportion of those who have suffered for the principles which we hold dear. Such cases crowd the pages of history for many centuries. In Italy, Germany, Switzerland, France, England,—in almost every country of Europe,—Baptists have been tortured and slain in vast numbers for these very principles. They could not

yield what they believed to be the truth of God; life could be given up, but not truth.

It would be impossible to tell how terrible were the storms of persecution which fell upon the unoffending Waldenses, and Albigenses; how fierce and fiendish the rage of their destroyers; how many thousands of them suffered similar atrocities to those which have been recently perpetrated in the provinces of Turkey. The history of their persecutions is one continuous record of fire and sword, the rack and the gibbet, the most inhuman tortures and heartrending scenes. Tens of thousands were tortured and slain simply for their *opinions*. Their persecutors acknowledged that they were persons of blameless life and loyal subjects; but they held certain religious principles, which have always been hated by ungodly men and worldly christians.

The names of very many might be given who suffered martyrdom in England, alike under Bloody Mary and Protestant Elizabeth, solely for holding these views; but the details of their tortures and death are dreadful. In the sixteenth century immense numbers of Baptists suffered by fine, imprisonment, banishment or burning. For details, see *Cramp's Baptist History*, chapters v. and vi.

One case may be given to illustrate the kind of persecution Baptists had to suffer in England as late as the *latter part of the 17th century*. Rev. Benjamin Keach was a Baptist minister at Winslow, in Buckinghamshire. He afterwards became pastor of the same church to which Rev. C. H. Spurgeon now ministers, at the Metropolitan Tabernacle, London.

"In 1664, Mr. Keach published a little book for the use of children, entitled, '*The Child's Instructor; or a New and Easy Primer.*' For this he was summoned to appear at the assizes at Aylesbury, Oct. 8, 1664. Being brought to the bar, the clerk said, 'Benjamin Keach, hear your charge. Thou art here indicted, by the name of Benjamin Keach, of Winslow, in the County of Bucks, for that thou being a seditious, schismatic person, evilly and maliciously disposed, and disaffected to His Majesty's government, and the government of the Church of England, didst maliciously and wickedly, on the 5th of May, in the 16th year of the reign of our sovereign lord the King, write, print, and publish, or cause to be written, printed, and published, one seditious and venomous book, entitled, *The Child's Instructor; or a New and Easy Primer*; wherein are contained, by way of question and answer, these damnable positions, contrary to the Book of Common Prayer, and the

liturgy of the Church of England; that is to say, in one place you have thus written:—

Q.—Who are the right subjects for baptism?

A.—Believers, or godly men and women, who make profession of their faith and repentance.

“In another place you have maliciously and wickedly written these words:—

Q.—How shall it go with the saints when Christ cometh?

A.—Very well; it is the day they have longed for. Then shall they hear the sentence ‘Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you;’ and so shall they reign with Christ on the earth a thousand years, even on Mount Sion, in the New Jerusalem.

“In another place you have wickedly and maliciously written these plain English words:—*Q.*—Why may not infants be received into the Church now, as they were under the law? *A.*—Because the fleshly seed is cast out. Though God under that dispensation did receive infants in a lineal way by generation; yet he that hath the key of David, that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth, hath shut up this way into the church, and opened the door of regeneration, receiving in none now but true believers. *Q.*—What is the case of infants? *A.*—Infants that die are members of the Kingdom of glory, though they be not members of the visible church. *Q.*—Do they, then, that bring in infants in a lineal way by generation, err from the way of truth? *A.*—Yea, they do; for they make not God’s holy word their rule, but do presume to open a door that Christ hath shut, and none ought to open.”

“The judge bade the jury bring him in guilty, and then pronounced the following sentence:—‘Benjamin Keach, you are here convicted for writing, printing and publishing a seditious and schismatical book, for which the court’s judgment is this, and the court doth award: that you shall go to gaol for a fortnight without bail or mainprize; and the next Saturday to stand upon the pillory at Aylesbury, in the open market, from eleven o’clock till one, with a paper upon your head with this inscription:—*For writing, printing, and publishing a schismatical book, entitled, ‘The Child’s Instructor; or a New and Easy Primer.’* And the next Thursday to stand, in the same manner and for the same time, in the market at Winslow; and then your book shall be openly burnt before your face by the common hangmen, in disgrace of you and your doctrine. And you shall forfeit to the King’s Majesty the sum of twenty

pounds, and shall remain in gaol until you find sureties for your good behaviour, and for your appearance at the next assizes; then to renounce your doctrines, and make such public submission as shall be enjoined you."

This inhuman sentence was rigorously carried out. "His head and hands were no sooner placed in the pillory than he began to address himself to the spectators to this effect:—"Good people, I am not ashamed to stand here this day, with this paper on my head! my Lord Jesus was not ashamed to suffer on the cross for me; and it is for His cause that I am made a gazing-stock. Take notice, it is not for any wickedness that I stand here, but for writing and publishing those truths which the Spirit of the Lord hath revealed in the Holy Scriptures."—*The Metrop. Tabernacle, its History and Work, by C. H. Spurgeon.*

Let us now take a glance at America two hundred years ago, and see how Baptists were treated there. We might reasonably suppose that those who had fled from tyranny in the old world, in order that they might find on this side of the Atlantic "freedom to worship God," would appreciate and practice toleration in their new home. But what are the facts? The Puritans bitterly persecuted those whose religious views differed from theirs, and the Baptists especially felt the force of their intolerance. By statute law it was ordered, in 1636, in the Colony of Massachusetts, that "no person, being a member of any church, which shall hereafter be gathered without the approbation of the magistrates, and the greater part of said churches, shall be admitted to the freedom of this commonwealth," thus disfranchising all who were not of the standing order. In the same year it was enacted that "if any Christain shall openly condemn the baptizing of infants, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the administration of that ordinance, and continuing obstinate therein, he shall be sentenced to be banished."

In 1651, Obadiah Holmes and John Clark, two Baptist ministers, came from Newport to Lynn, Mass., and attempted to hold a religious service at the house of William Witter, a Baptist. While Mr. Clark was preaching they were arrested by order of the magistrates. At the trial they were charged chiefly with baptizing, and denying the validity of infant baptism, and Mr. Clark was fined twenty pounds, and Mr. Holmes thirty pounds, and in default of payment to be whipped. The latter would not, or could not, pay the fine, and "without mercy, his back was laid bare, and the lash laid on for conscience' sake.

The flesh hung in gory welts, and yet the blows fell ; the blood ran down his legs and made puddles on the ground, and yet the blows fell, until intolerance was satisfied. 'As the strokes fell upon me,' he says, 'I had such a spiritual manifestation of God's presence as I never had before, and the outward pain was so removed from me that I well could bear it; yea, I felt it not although it was grievous, as the spectators said, the man striking with all his strength (yea, spitting in his hands three times, as many affirmed), with a three-corded whip, giving me therewith thirty strokes.'"

This was not in Madrid or Rome, but in New England—the land of the free. It was not done by the Inquisitors of the middle ages, but by the poor, meek, persecuted Puritans, who, a few years before, longed so earnestly for religious liberty.

As we look back over the noble army of Baptist martyrs, all along the centuries, suffering for the truth as it is in Jesus, and sealing their testimony with their blood, we feel that here is a succession worth talking about, and worth defending; a succession of apostolic principles and apostolic men. We are thankful for such a spiritual pedigree.

Had not these principles been immortal as the Word of God, they would have faded forever from the earth, when all the world waged war against them for ages. Well may we with wonder ask why such principles have always been spoken against, and their advocates persecuted. There is nothing in these doctrines that is injurious to men morally or spiritually; nothing that is hostile to the welfare of society; nothing that is subversive of law and good government. And yet they have, from the beginning, been fiercely opposed, and their adherents have been the objects of the most relentless tyranny. Perhaps we may find the explanation in the fact that the truth, even when uttered by the Son of God, was hated and resisted, and that He—the very truth itself—was crowned with thorns and crucified.

OUR POSITION.

Wisdom says, "Let another man praise thee and not thine own mouth." Let us hear, then, what others have said.

The late Dr. Wood, of Andover, Mass., in 1854 thus expressed himself:—"I entertain the most cordial esteem, love, and confidence towards the Baptists, as a denomination. I have had the freest intercourse, and the sincerest friendship with Baptist ministers, theological students, and private Christians. And I

have wished that our denomination—the Congregational—was as free from erratic speculations, and as well grounded in the doctrines and experimental principles of the Puritans, as the Baptists. It seems to me that *they are the Christians who are likely to maintain pure Christianity and to hold fast the form of sound words.*"

The great Scotch Presbyterian, Dr. Chalmers, pays the following tribute to the English Baptists:—"Let it never be forgotten, of the Particular Baptists of England, that they form the denomination of Fuller, and Carey, and Ryland, and Hall, and Foster; that they have originated among the greatest of all missionary enterprises; that they have enriched the Christian literature of our country with authorship of the most exalted piety, as well as of the first talent, and the first eloquence; that they have waged a very noble and successful war with the hydra of Antinomianism; that perhaps there is not a more intellectual community of ministers in our islands, or who have put forth, to their number, a greater amount of mental power and mental activity in the defence and illustration of our common faith; and what is better than all the triumphs of genius or understanding, who by their zeal and fidelity and pastoral labor among congregations which they have reared, have done more to swell the list of genuine discipleship in the walks of private society, and thus both to uphold and extend the living Christianity of our nation."

Baptists have no cause to be ashamed of the roll call of their illustrious men. Passing by the notable names of the early and middle ages, and coming down to modern times, we might point to JOHN BUNYAN, "the immortal dreamer," whose great allegory has been translated into more languages of the world than any other book except the Bible; to JOHN MILTON, whose colossal genius produced the "Paradise Lost;" to ROBERT HALL, that most finished pulpit orator, the Chrysostom of modern times; to JOHN FOSTER, whom Sir James Mackintosh pronounces "one of the most profound and eloquent writers that England has produced;" to ANDREW FULLER, the eminent theologian, who "traverses with giant steps the whole empire of Revelation, and of reason, as its handmaid;" to JOHN HOWARD, the devoted philanthropist, and unselfish reformer; to WILLIAM CAREY, the first missionary from Great Britain to India, who, during the forty years of his labors in that land, in connection with his associates, published over two hundred and twelve thousand volumes of the Bible, in forty different languages; to ADONIRAM JUDSON,

the heroic Apostle of Burmah, one of the first missionaries that ever left the shores of America for a heathen land ; to SIR HENRY HAVELOCK, the valiant Christian warrior, whose name and fame can never be forgotten while the dreadful memories of Lucknow remain ; to C. H. SPURGEON, confessedly the most eminent of living preachers, who, from his pulpit, addresses the largest assembly that *regularly* convenes to-day in the world, for religious purposes.

The *first Missionary Society*, for the purpose of evangelizing the heathen, was founded by the Baptists, in 1792. Of the efforts of this Society, Chambers' Cyclopedia thus speaks :—"No mission band has arisen in any denomination within the century who have surpassed the agents of the Baptist Missionary Society in ardent zeal, patient perseverance, and invincible fortitude, in carrying out their Lord's commission to preach the gospel to every creature. The names of Carey, Marshman, Ward and Knibb will be had in grateful remembrance by all succeeding generations ; and their footsteps are now being trod by a long list of Christian missionaries of all evangelical persuasions, who are 'the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ.'"

The *first Bible Society* (British and Foreign), having for its object to give the Holy Scriptures to all the world, was originated by a Baptist, Rev. Joseph Hughes, of Battersea, near London. The translation and dissemination of the Word of God have always formed an important part of the work done by Baptists. The London *Quarterly Review* referring, in 1809, to the labors of Carey and his friends in India, said, "In fourteen years they have done more towards spreading the knowledge of the scriptures among the heathen than all the world besides."

The *first Evangelical Christian churches* in India, Burmah, Siam and China were Baptist churches. And the standard of the cross, raised by the faithful and fearless pioneers, now waves over multitudes reclaimed from heathenism.

STATISTICS, ETC.

The increase of the Baptists is remarkable. For example :—In the United States, in the year 1770, there were 77 Baptist churches, now there are about 23,000, with almost 2,000,000 of members,—that is, communicants. During the last fifty years we have gained, in that country, more than 17,500 churches, equivalent to more than one church every day during all those

years. There are over fifty churches of our denomination in the City of Philadelphia alone.

In the Dominion of Canada we have 667 churches, and 52,894 members; in the West Indies, 153 churches, 27,884 members; in Great Britain, 2,617 churches, 265,797 members; in Germany, 103 churches, 19,997 members; in Sweden, 234 churches, 10,495 members; in Hindustan and Ceylon, 104 churches, 10,623 members; in Burmah, 404 churches, 19,671 members. Including those in all lands, we obtain the following numbers:

	Churches.	Members.
Europe, - - - -	3,080	302,335
Asia, - - - -	518	31,199
Africa, - - - -	52	1,997
America, - - - -	23,828	2,013,314
Australasia, - - - -	162	6,756
	27,640	2,355,601

And these principles are spreading very rapidly, and indirectly affecting those who will not yet acknowledge that they are scriptural. References to the statistics of other denominations show that, in the United States especially, infant baptism is gradually declining, the number of adult baptisms far exceeding those of infants. It is stated that in that country, "not one child in ten receives the rite." Multitudes are becoming convinced of the unscripturalness of such an ordinance; and conscientious Christians, when they see clearly that there is no warrant for it in God's word, will abandon it. Large numbers of Pedobaptist ministers, every year, adopt Baptist principles, and become connected with the denomination. Inquiry has recently been made of the Baptist pastors in Brooklyn, N. Y., as to their previous training, with the following results:—*Thirteen* were trained as Baptists; *fifteen* were not so trained, but have come to us as follows:—Presbyterian 5; Methodist, 4; Episcopal, 2; Lutheran; 1; Quaker, 1; Reformed Dutch, 1, and one who says of himself, "I was never trained to any belief, but when converted, at seventeen years of age, became a Baptist by solemn convictions from reading the New Testament, and remain so." As is well known, Rev. Mr. Dunn (Presbyterian), of Boston, and Revs. T. D. Talmage, and H. W. Beecher, of Brooklyn, have baptisteries in their houses of worship, for the immersion of those who desire it; and now it is understood that a similar convenience will probably be put into Mr. Moody's new church edifice in Chicago.

In view of the prosperity granted to us a people, and the

prospects of still greater triumphs of the truth, we will but say, to God be *all* the praise.

As regards their relations with other Christian communities, and with their fellow men in general, Baptists are not open to the charge sometimes brought against them—of illiberality or exclusiveness. They are always ready to co-operate with their fellow Christians of other persuasions, in religious effort, in benevolent institutions, in the promotion of every enterprise for the mental, moral, and spiritual welfare of the world, in every good cause, *where no compromise of principle is involved*. They entertain sincere respect and love for the people of God of every name, and are ready to manifest this Christian friendship as fully and unmistakably as any, but *they will not sacrifice God's truth*.

Baptists are not, *according to the historical signification of the term*, Protestants. They do *in reality* protest, as their predecessors have always done, against *all* that is unscriptural in doctrine or practice, *wherever* it exists; but Protestantism, so-called, is only as old as A. D. 1529, when the celebrated Protest of certain German states and princes was made at the Diet of Spires. We say to Protestants, God speed you, and help you to do a good work! You have reason to protest against the errors of that body from which you came out, only you do not carry your protest far enough. We never were enclosed within her pale, but we rejoice in the work you are doing, and would rejoice more fully if it were more *thorough*. Oh that the Reformers had accomplished a complete Reformation! Oh that they had left certain things behind them when they came out! How much more glorious, more powerful, and more triumphant would the Reformation have been! But it was scarcely to be expected that they could at once shake off *all* the errors among which they had been reared. It was a great spiritual resurrection, and in coming forth from the tomb some of the grave clothes clung to them. How desirable that their descendants should complete the work which they began, and now render the Reformation perfect.

The word of our God shall stand forever. It may be opposed and its holy light obscured for a time, but in the end it must be acknowledged. The Bible is the only infallible guide amid the varying currents of human opinion. But if it is to be our guide, it must be *fully accepted*, and *implicitly obeyed*. Neither long-standing custom, nor natural inclination, nor self-interest, nor the example of numbers, nor any other consideration should

be suffered for a moment to stand between us and the hearty reception of, and unhesitating obedience to the teachings of Jesus. In God's book we are counselled to "buy the truth and sell it not." Oh, the *truth*, the *truth of God*, what a blessed possession! Be it ours to embrace and keep it, unadulterated by human opinions or traditions; for when we appear before our Master's throne nothing but Truth will stand.



y
f
d
d
y
r

103

8

1